## 2 4 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT **DISTRICT OF NEVADA** 6 7 DAVID PERSI, Case No. 2:22-cv-02087-JCM-NJK 8 Plaintiff(s), Order 9 v. [Docket No. 9] 10 MGM GRAND HOTEL, LLC, 11 Defendant(s). 12 Pending before the Court is a stipulation to extend the deadline for Defendant to respond to the complaint by 29 days. Docket No. 9. 14 A request to extend deadlines must be supported by a showing of good cause. See, e.g., Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(b)(1). 15 16 Defendant has already had two months to prepare a response to the complaint. See Docket 17 No. 6. The instant request is predicated almost entirely on the fact that counsel has been busy attending to other matters, Docket No. 9 at 2, but an attorney taking on an unmanageable caseload is assuredly not good cause for an extension, e.g., Williams v. James River Grp. Inc., F. Supp. 3d , 2022 WL 4181415, at \*4 (D. Nev. Sept. 13, 2022). As a one-time courtesy, the Court 20 21 will allow an extension of seven days. 22 Accordingly, the stipulation is **GRANTED** in part and **DENIED** in part.<sup>2</sup> The deadline to respond to the complaint is **EXTENDED** to February 23, 2023. The Court is not inclined to grant 24 <sup>1</sup> The existence of settlement discussions is also a routine aspect of federal litigation, see, e.g., Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(f)(2), and does not generally constitute good cause for an extension, e.g., Williams, 2022 WL 4181415, at \*5. 26 <sup>2</sup> The stipulation references an extension to the briefing schedule for a forthcoming motion to dismiss, Docket No. 9 at 2, a request that is not properly before the Court, see Local Rule IC 2-2(b) (separate requests must be filed separately). The Court does not express any opinion herein as to that briefing schedule.

further extension requests. Cf. Fed. R. Civ. P. 16(b)(2) (a scheduling order should generally be issued within 90 days of service or 60 days from a defendant's appearance). IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated: February 17, 2023 Nancy J. Koppe United States Magistrate Judge